

N62473-15-R-0811
RADMAC II
QUESTIONS & ANSWERS #4
14 July 2015

1. Were powdered explosive materials/munitions constituents used in Buildings 211 or 253?

RESPONSE: It is possible that explosive materials were used in Building 253 since it was once used for ordnance shops and a weapons shop and mentioned in the PWS, section 1.2 Background.

2. Is the Building 253 elevator functional?

RESPONSE: No

3. Section 2.4.1.4 of Attachment J3 Seed Project PWS states that no load-bearing walls shall be compromise or removed. Several of the concrete columns were identified as being contaminated.

a. Is decontamination / remediation required on the structural components of the building?

b. If yes to above question, must a structural analysis be conducted prior to any decontamination efforts on building structural components?

RESPONSE:

a. Yes.

b. A separate structural analysis is a decision the offeror must make. The Navy's main concern is that the building's integrity is not compromised that could lead to a collapse of the building.

4. After remediation of Building 211 and 253 will the Navy require a final status survey of the entire building or just the affected survey units and adjacent survey units?

RESPONSE: A final status survey will need to be completed for all of the contaminated areas that are mentioned in the internal draft characterization report.

5. Are CAD drawings available with the location and size of the contaminated areas?

RESPONSE: All reference documents for PTO 0001 were uploaded to AMERDEC. Other available drawings can be found at the Care Taker Office in Treasure Island at 1 Ave of the Palms, Suite 161, San Francisco, CA 94130-1807. Please call Glen Nelson for an appointment at 510-224-0566.

6. PWS Section 1, 3rd paragraph, requires the contractor to have both a current NRC and California Agreement State Radioactive Material "Service Provider" licenses. Since the NRC views invoking both licenses as redundant, should the contractor plan to invoke the generally more restrictive California license?

RESPONSE: The work contained in PTO 0001 falls within the NRC jurisdiction (Buildings 253/211) and the State jurisdiction (RSYs in Parcel E). For this purpose, the Navy must request the contractor to have both NRC and State of California licenses. Many of contractors in the past did not have both licenses which led to delays with the agencies. The Navy will not direct the contractor to

invoke one license over the other as this is an agreement with either NRC or the State. The contractor will be responsible to decide which license to invoke to provide the service that is requested in this solicitation.

7. PWS Section 1, 4th paragraph, 4th sentence, requires that all regulatory agency comments on deliverables be resolved. Is it implied and understood that the comments will be resolved by the contractor in a manner satisfactory to the Navy and consistent with the contractor's contractual obligations to the Navy?

RESPONSE: Please see response to Q&A #2 dated 2 July 2015, Question #18.

8. PWS Section 1, 4th paragraph, 5th sentence, defines successful project completion as concurrence on the FSS report and SUPRs, and obtaining unrestricted free release of the sites by USEPA, CDPH, and DTSC.

- a. In light of previous difficulties encountered by the Navy in working with regulators, what latitude, if any, will be available to the contractor to assist in grooming the Navy's approach to obtaining regulatory concurrence?
- b. Corollary to the above, what recourse, if any, will be available to the contractor in the event the contractor disagrees with the Navy's approach to obtaining regulatory concurrence and is unable to achieve successful project completion as defined?

RESPONSE: a. and b. Recognizing that the contractor and the Navy objectives may not completely overlap, there is no recourse if the contractor disagrees with the Navy's approach to accomplish Navy's objectives. If the contractor has a reasonable approach based on experience on similar projects in California with the same regulatory agencies, the Navy would be willing to evaluate a new approach. Working meetings may be necessary to ensure proper communication with the Navy and regulators.

9. PWS Section 1.2, para. 10, states the Navy, "...has determined that the building components including building drain lines and subsurface drain lines contain residual radioactive contamination" and notes that the characterization reports have not obtained final Navy and regulatory acceptance/ concurrence and therefore are subject to change and revision.

- a. Is the contractor to assume that the Navy's determination is consistent with the findings and recommendations contained in the internal draft characterization reports provided to bidders?
- b. What provisions, if any, will be available to the contractor to mitigate cost impacts that may occur based on changes to the characterization report made after award?

RESPONSE: a. Yes, for purposes of this solicitation, all bids should be written according to the determinations described in the internal draft characterization report.

- b. Any changes to the report will be discussed with the contractor who wins the seed project. Any additional work outside of the internal draft characterization report may be handled as a modification or an entirely new task order. These decisions will be made at time of award.

10. PWS Section 2.2.3, 3rd sentence, requires the contractor to remove all waste materials, rubbish, dust and windblown debris from the work areas and adjacent areas as a condition precedent to final acceptance of the work by the Government. Will material and equipment already identified as contaminated and stockpiled within Building 211/253 require re-survey for disposal as LLRW?

RESPONSE: Any material and equipment (M&E) that is identified as being contaminated will not be required to be resurveyed before disposal. However, any M&E that is in question as being previously surveyed should be surveyed to avoid disposing of clean material as LLRW.

11. PWS Section 2.3.1.1 requires the contractor to develop work instructions for each contaminated building survey unit. Does the Navy expect all the work instructions (over 40) to be developed prior to the start of field activities or can work instructions be developed and approved by the Navy prior to work beginning in the individual survey units?

RESPONSE: The work instructions need to be developed and approved by the Navy prior to the work commencing for each survey unit.

12. PWS Section 2.3.3 requires the contractor to develop a revision to the *Final Basewide Radiological Removal Action – Action Memorandum (Revision 2006)* which will focus on revising the release criteria set forth in Table 1.

- a. Since the document with its revised release criteria may affect the nature and extent of Building 211/253 radiological remediation, is the contractor expected to delay related activities until the document is approved?
- b. If the contractor commences radiological remediation activities prior to the document's approval in order to conform to the 24-month period of performance, is reliance on the document's revised release criteria considered an at-risk activity of the contractor?

RESPONSE: a. The Action Memorandum is the main CERCLA decision document that drives the project. Work cannot be finalized until this document is approved and final.

b. The schedule and timing can be discussed at time of the award of then seed project.

13. PWS Section 2.4.2, 2nd paragraph, last sentence, states: "The survey units that do not contain contamination are already complete." Is it appropriate for the contractor to assume that characterization data collected is adequate for release and no additional data collection will occur in those survey units?

RESPONSE: Yes

14. Will additional lead or asbestos mitigation activities be required prior to the start of remediation?

RESPONSE: Most asbestos mitigation has already been performed. However, the contractor may have to mitigate asbestos in areas where work was not previous performed at.

15. Based on a review of the Building 253 and the Building 211 Characterization Reports, there are several areas of the buildings that were not previously surveyed and characterized for safety or other logistics reasons – these include turret pits, periscope tower, chimney system, and Survey Units 143, 144, 153, and 154.

- a. What is the Navy's expectation for contractor work to be performed in these areas with regard to the project objective of obtaining free release of the buildings?
- b. If the Navy is not requiring/expecting further work from the contractor in these areas, can the contractors reasonably be expected to obtain free release approval from the regulatory agencies?

RESPONSE: a. Any areas that have not been previously surveyed due to safety concerns do not need to be remediated within this solicitation.
 b. Free-release will be requested for the areas that are mentioned in the internal draft characterization report.

16. Based on review of the Characterization Reports, Cs-137 activity was identified in the elevator pit in Building 253. Does the Navy require additional surveys of the elevator shaft?

RESPONSE: If the contractor is questioning the status of contamination, resurveying is allowed for proper evaluation to obtain a free-release status.

17. PWS Section 2.4.1.4 Backfill and Site Restoration Conditions – the PWS is not specific as to the surface restoration of any trenching performed to remove sewer lines. The section states that the interior of the building does not need to be restored to pre-remediation conditions but does not give specifics on the required completion of the surface. The PWS also does not give specifics regarding any surface restoration requirements for trenching outside the building.

- a. Should the interior trenches be restored to Durable Cover standards applied to the rest of Parcel C by the contractor?
- b. If another separate contractor will perform durable cover installation on trenches, are there subgrade prep requirements that should be implemented by the contractor in anticipation? Any compaction requirements?
- c. Same question for external lines.

RESPONSE:

- a. Yes
- b. Additional work conducted regarding the durable cover will be discussed at time of award and will result in a modification to this contract since this solicitation is only to obtain free-release of the specific areas noted in the internal draft characterization report.
- c. See answer to b.

18. Does the Navy require additional investigation or remediation of the inaccessible drain lines that were left in place? If not, how can the objective of free release by contractors be reasonably expected?

RESPONSE: All areas should be considered to be investigated or remediated to obtain free-release. However if the areas are not accessible due to safety reasons or other major limiting factors, these areas will need to be discussed with the Navy and a modification or separate task order may be required.

19. PWS Section 3.9 Liquidated Damages

- a. Should this LD clause be incorporated into the base contract (as a general program provision) or is the clause meant to be project-specific?

- b. If project specific, are the LDs specifically tied to any quantifiable monetary damage cause to the Government due to a delay which would invoke the LDs?
- c. What is the “time specified in the contract” that is referenced in this section to invoke LDs?
- d. Are LDs applicable if either the Navy or Agency exceeds stipulated FFA review times, causing the contractor to extend beyond the schedule specified in the contract?

RESPONSE: Please see Q&A #3, dated 10 July 2015, responses to questions #38, 39, and 40.

20. PWS 2.1.2.2 BRAC Closure Team (BCT) Meetings – How many BCT meeting are required?

RESPONSE: The Navy will not direct the contractor on the number of BCT meetings.

21. PWS 2.1.2.3 Contractor Integration Meetings – What is location of two CIM?

RESPONSE: The CIMs will either be held in San Francisco or in Oakland.

22. PWS 2.1.2.4 Community Meetings/Bus Tours – How Many Community Meetings are required?

RESPONSE: The Navy does will not direct the contractor on the number of the community meetings.

23. Government RFI #6 issued on 2 July 2015 refers to additional files to be posted to Amerdec. What files are yet anticipated for uploading? It will be extremely difficult for Offerors to meet the current proposal deadline of July 23 without all relevant files this week.

- a. To allow adequate time for Offerors to review and incorporate information into our proposal, can the Navy please upload all remaining items by this week, July 10?
- b. Can the Navy provide a two week extension once all files are uploaded to Amerdec and Offerors notified to allow Offerors adequate time to review and incorporate the information into our proposal?

RESPONSE: a. All relevant PWS documents have been uploaded to AMERDEC or they are available at the Care Taker Office in San Francisco, CA.

b. Anytime extension will be done by formal Amendment to the solicitation. Please monitor FedBizOps/NECO.

24. Can the Navy please verify the number of BCT meetings included in Task 2.1.2.2?

RESPONSE: The Navy will not direct the contractor on the number of BCT meetings.

25. Can the Navy please verify the number of Community Meetings included in Task 2.1.2.4?

RESPONSE: The Navy will not direct the contractor on the number of community meetings.

26. Per RFP Factor 4 Technical Approach Proposed Task Order 0001, Tab 4B (2), offerors should include a resume for the Site Radiation Safety Officer (named on the license). Is this the same resume as the Radiation Safety Officer identified in Section C.1.3.3. E)?

RESPONSE: No, the Site Radiation Safety Officer is a Non-Key personnel position. The qualifications for the Site Radiation Safety Officer will be added by Amendment 01 to Section C.1.3.5 Non-key Personnel Requirements.

27. What is the anticipated start date for award of the Seed Project, PTO 001?

RESPONSE: September 23, 2015, assuming no delays in the schedule.

28. In the Draft PWS Factor 3, Tab B. item b. requires a description of the contract management systems. The RFP issued on June 23, 2015 removed this item b. requirement from the submission requirements for Factor 3; however, the RFP still lists 'contract management' as an evaluation measure of Factor 3. Can the Navy remove this reference to 'contract management' from the evaluation of Tab 3B?

RESPONSE: No. Please follow the requirements of the Official RFP dated June 23, 2015. All draft documents previously issued during the Industry Forum were for informational purposes only and have been replaced.